

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application as amended is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action dated January 24, 2005, claims 1-34 were pending and rejected.

In this response, no claim has been cancelled or amended. Declarations under 37 C.F.R.

1.131 and 1.132 have been submitted. No new matter has been added.

The Examiner objected to the Applicant's declaration pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.132 filed in a previous response that the Applicant failed to declare he is the "sole inventor" of the subject matter in the article entitled "An Overview of JPEG-2000". Accordingly, a new declaration has been submitted.

Claims 1, 5, 9-10, 14, 18-20, 27 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Christopoulos et al. ("The JPEG2000 STILL IMAGE CODING SYSTEM: AN OVERVIEW," Charilaos Christopoulos, et al., IEEE Transactions on Consumer Electronics, vol. 46, No.4, November 2000, pages 1103-1127, hereafter referred to as Christopoulos paper, hereinafter Christopoulos). A declaration under 37 C.F.R. 1.131 has been submitted herein to swear behind Christopoulos.

In addition, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-34 include limitations that are not disclosed by Christopoulos. In particular, for example, independent claim 1 includes reading one or more markers to determine the existing progression order (e.g., a first progression order) and converting the codestream from the first progression order into the second progression order (e.g., new progression order), for example, without decoding and re-encoding the codestream as recited in claims 27 and 34. Thereafter, the markers are updated to reflect on the second progression order.

That is, the conversion is performed based on the information from the markers (without decoding and re-encoding the codestream). The conversion is simply part of reorder the codestream according to the progression order indicated by the one or more markers. Thereafter, the new progression order information is updated in the markers for future uses. It is respectfully submitted that the above limitations are absent from Christopoulos.

In contrast, Christopoulos requires that the source image to be decomposed into components. The image and its components are decomposed into rectangular tiles. The tile-component is the basic unit of the original or reconstructed image (see, left column of page 1106 of Christopoulos). These operations clearly require decoding and re-encoding operations.

In addition, the markers of Christopoulos are not used to indicate the progression order. Rather, the markers of Christopoulos are added in the bitstream to allow error resilience (see, right column of page 1106 of Christopoulos). In order to anticipate a claim, each and every limitations of the claim must be taught by the cited references. It is respectfully submitted that Christopoulos fails to disclose the limitations set forth above. Therefore, independent claim 1 is not anticipated by Christopoulos.

Similarly, independent claims 10 and 19-20 include limitations similar to those recited in claim 1. Thus, for the reasons similar to those discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 10 and 19-20 are not anticipated by Christopoulos.

Given that the rest of the claims depend from one of the above independent claims. Thus, for the reasons similar to those discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that the rest of the claims are not anticipated by Christopoulos.

In addition, with respect to claims 27 and 34, these claims include limitations that converting the codestream is performed using an array of packet structures, where each of the

packet structures corresponds to each layer of each tile in the codestream. The conversion is further based on at least one of layer, resolution, component, and precinct progression information of the packet structures without having to decode and re-encode the codestream. It is respectfully submitted that none of the cited references discloses or suggests the limitations set forth above.

Although Christopoulos discloses using an array, Christopoulos fails to disclose or suggest that each of the packet structures corresponds to each layer of each tile in the codestream and the conversion is further based on at least one of layer, resolution, component, and precinct progression information of the packet structures without having to decode and re-encode the code.

Claims 2, 6-8, 11, and 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Christopoulos paper as applied to Claims 1 and 10, and further in view of Christopoulos et al. (US published patent application 2001/0047517 cited previously, hereafter referred as Christopoulos published application.) A declaration under 37 C.F.R. 1.131 has been submitted herein to swear behind Christopoulos published application.

Claims 23-26 and 30-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Christopoulos paper as applied to Claims 5 and 14, and further in view of ISO/IEC 15444-1 (Information technology-JPEG 2000 imaging coding system-Part 1: Core coding system, 12/15/2000 cited in IDS filed 9/2/2004.).

Claims 3-4, 12-13, 21-22, 28-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Christopoulos paper and Christopoulos published application as applied to Claims 2, 6, 11, and 15, and further in view of ISO/IEC 15444-1 (Information technology- JPEG 2000 image coding system- Part 1: Core coding system, 12/15/2000 cited in IDS filed 9/2/2004.)

In view of the foregoing remarks, for the reasons similar to those discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that none of the cited references above discloses or suggests the limitations set forth above. Therefore, claims 1-34 are patentable over the cited references.


In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits the present application is now in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite or assist in the allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (408) 720-8300.

Please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any shortage of fees in connection with this response.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN

Date: June 24, 2005



Kevin G. Shao
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 45,095

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026
(408) 720-8300